we know what exactly the savings would be and then decide under what items the savings will have to be spent.

**Mr. P. Krishna Menon.**—Am I to understand that the foundation has not been laid as yet?

**Mr. P. V. Raphael.**—No.

## Opening of a road from near Kizhur hill to Vettikadavu and Vaduthala roads.

**267. Mr. K. T. Mathew.**—Will the Government be pleased to state what action has been taken by the Government to open a road from near Kizhur Hill at Kunnamkulam to Vettikadavu and Vaduthala roads for which provision is made in the current year's budget; and whether the whole amount provided in the budget will be utilised for the same purpose before the end of 1108; and if not, why not?

**Mr. P. V. Raphael.**—The work has already been let on contract at 42 7/8 % less than the estimated rates. But the acquisition proceedings are not yet complete and the sites handed over to the Panchayat. As soon as the sites are taken possession of the work will be pushed through and every attempt made to complete the same this year itself. As the work is let on contract at good percentage of deduction, it may not be necessary to spend the whole sanctioned amount on the work. The exact amount of savings, if any, can, however, be ascertained only after the work is completed.

**Mr. K. T. Mathew.** Will the Government expedite the land acquisition proceedings?

**Mr. P. V. Raphael.**—Yes.

## Bad workmanship in the execution of repairs to Pulikkalchira.

**268. Mr. T. K. Nayar.**—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) has any work of repairs to Pulikkalchira under the Chelakkara Panchayat been executed in 1107;

(2) if so, was it carried out quite in accordance with the estimate;

(3) was there any deviation in the actual execution;

(4) during the course of execution, has any bad workmanship been pointed out by adjacent landowners;

(5) was there any petition from the interested parties for the rectification of bad work done;

(6) was any action taken to rectify the mistakes pointed out.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(7) when were the planks of shutters finally fixed in ;

(8) has the Registrar of Panchayats been informed of the damages caused to the apron floor causing leakages soon after the planks were fixed in ;

(9) has the Registrar inspected the works after the floors were damaged ;

(10) what steps have been taken to get the damages repaired since ;

(11) does the Government propose to effect further improvements to the chira as requested by the adjacent land-owners ?

**Mr. P. V. Raphael.**—(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) No.

(4) and (5) There was no bad workmanship. But one Mr. C. V. Krishna Ayyar has petitioned that the retaining wall work has not been properly done. The estimate provision was only to have a floor of 12' wide in combination mortar and the remaining width of the apron in clay. The petitioner wanted the whole floor done in combination mortar which was not necessary.

(6) No answer is necessary.

(7) On 3-3-1108.

(8) Yes.

(9) No. But the Overseer inspected the chira and found that the damages were very much exaggerated.

(10) The damages being very light they will be attended to this year.

(11) The petitioners want some improvements to the chira system, such as raising the sill level of the water courses off-taking from the chira by resorting to the acquisition of a bund put up by some ryots. These improvements are not urgent nor are they necessary. Any further improvement to the chira can be attended to only if the interested ryots contribute towards their cost.

**Mr. T. K. Nayar.**—May I know what the damages are?

**Mr. P. V. Raphael.**—A few stones in the new apron have been misplaced and this will be attended to immediately.

**Mr. T. K. Nayar.**—Does the chira contain any water?

**Mr. P. V. Raphael.**—There is no water now.

**Mr. T. K. Nayar.**—Was this brought to the notice of the Registrar during the time of construction?

**Mr. P. V. Raphael.**—This damage was caused only after the construction and during the heavy rains in the monsoon.

**Mr. T. K. Nayar.**—What was the complaint of this gentleman referred to in (4) and (5)—Mr. C. V. Krishna Ayyar?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

**Mr. P. V. Raphael.**—The answer is given in (11).

**Mr. T. K. Nayar.**—He pointed out that this 12 feet mortar work will not be sufficient.

**Mr. P. V. Raphael.**—It is true he pointed out that the whole thing cannot be done in mortar. But the retaining wall was sufficient, provided the shutters are adjusted and regulated properly. Unfortunately on the night of 3rd Thulam 1108 there were heavy rains and the shutter planks were not regulated properly.

## Arecanut Market—Ottupara.

**269. Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether Mr. Muhamed, licensee for arecanut market at Ottupara, holds a license for Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays of the week ;

(b) was there not a time when his license was only for Wednesdays of the week ;

(c) what was the fee levied when he was doing business only on Wednesdays ;

(d) what is the fee levied when business is done on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays;

(e) what is the annual income of the Ottupara arecant market ?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Rs. 100.

(d) Rs. 100.

(e) The exact annual income from the market is not known. There was no necessity to ascertain it according to the rules in force at the time of application for license. Since the rules have been revised in D. P. 18575/07, dated 12th January 1933, Development Department, and the fee fixed at 15 per cent of the gross income, the exact amount is being ascertained.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—Will the Government be pleased to allow any other person to conduct the market on days other than Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—I do not think Government have any objection.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—When was this conversion made?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—Three or four years back.

**Mr. K. G. Nayar.**—The fee levied for trading on a particular day was Rs. 100 and permission was granted. Have the Government considered the desirability of increasing the fee when the contractor was given permission to trade for 3 days?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly